



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,887	12/27/2001	Todd Lagimonier	003636.0114	1873
7590	09/18/2006			EXAMINER
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC ATTENTION: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN 2000 M WTREET, N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20016			WILLETT, STEPHAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
			DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/026,887	LAGIMONIER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephan F. Willett	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103□ and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. with Patent Number 6,792,605 in view of Landfeldt et al. with Publication Number 2002/0156841.

1. Regarding claim(s) 1, 7, 10, 19, 21, Roberts teaches providing numerous interrelated services in a distributed network. Roberts teaches receiving a request over a network, col. 4, lines 56-59. Roberts teaches retrieving a plurality of services associated with the request, col. 4-5, lines 66-1. Roberts teaches packing said services into a message object with associated data, col. 5, lines 13-18, including configuration parameters, col. 6, lines 1-4. Roberts teaches

transmitting the message to the first service, col. 5, lines 18-20 via a service-chaining module[web services engine] configured to retrieve a location of data as a “URL” with a “web services engine”, col. 5, lines 53-55 and an application program and data, col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 44-45 that functions as a chaining module to chain responses into one final response, col. 5, lines 18-20 with functionality on a second server as “calling other web services”, col. 7, lines 23-25, col. 10, lines 21-24 and requests to “another web services directory”, col. 15, lines 14-16. Roberts also teaches drivers, col. 5, lines 17-18 that run on each server that also coordinate or chain requests, col. 7, lines 22-25. Roberts teaches initiating a subsequent service, col. 5, lines 60-61; col. 7, lines 21-25; col. 11, lines 33-37; col. 14, lines 41-45. Roberts teaches packaging services associated with request into a list as input to another web service or packaging program and data location information into a message an itinerary message col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 44-45 object, col. 10, lines 60-63, through “runtime models” that “collaborate”, col. 14, lines 9-11 with data with WSAs as input or output, col. 14, lines 40-44 based on “what services are needed”, col. 5, lines 15 of at least one application program and data, col. 8, lines 67, col. 9, lines 44-45 to at least another server from a “central location” server, col. 4, lines 39-44.

2. Roberts teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching allowing the second server to directly service or forward data to the client . In that Roberts operates to generate service requests in a client/server environment, the artisan would have looked to the server arts for details of implementing data transfers. In that art, Landfeldt, a related network server, teaches “the proxy repositories can be provided ... as conventional web servers”, par. 34 in order to inserted into the client server communication path. Landfeldt specifically teaches the server communicates information on the client application via a proxy

path", par. 31. The proxy servers in the path then communicate directly with the client. The motivation to incorporate a direct communication with the client insures that resources are not wasted. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the direct server communication as taught in Landfeldt into the Web services described in the Roberts patent because Roberts operates with servers and Landfeldt suggests that optimization can be obtained with direct server communication. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claim(s) are rejected.

4. Regarding claim(s) 2, Roberts teaches receiving said object, and determining a service provider for said first service, col. 5, lines 56-61. Roberts teaches initiating service at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33. Roberts teaches initiating a subsequent service, col. 7, lines 21-25; col. 11, lines 33-37; col. 14, lines 41-45.

5. Regarding claim(s) 3, 8, 18, 20, Roberts teaches receiving said object, and determining a service provider for said first service, col. 5, lines 56-61. Roberts teaches initiating service at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33. Roberts teaches transmitting an object to a remote service provider, col. 9, line 44; col. 10, lines 1-4; col. 15, lines 14-16.

6. Regarding claim(s) 9, Roberts teaches receiving said object, and determining a service provider for said first service, col. 5, lines 56-61. Roberts teaches initiating service at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33. Roberts teaches initiating a subsequent service, col. 7, lines 21-25; col. 11, lines 33-37; col. 14, lines 41-45.

7. Regarding claim(s) 4, Roberts teaches determining service associated with a request from a profile/directory, col. 4-5, lines 66-1. Roberts teaches initiating service at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33. Roberts teaches determining a service provider for said first

service, col. 5, lines 56-61. Roberts teaches initiating/selecting a service request at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33.

8. Regarding claim(s) 5, 11, 14-15, Roberts teaches packaging services associated with request into an itinerary/list object as input to another web service, col. 14, lines 40-44; col. 22, lines 54-62, and as a “queue system”, col. 9, lines 42-43. Roberts teaches forwarding/initiating/selecting a service request/itinerary at a local service provider, col. 6, lines 28-33.

9. Regarding claim(s) 6, 17, completing forwarding/initiating/selecting a service request/itinerary at a local service provider, col. 10, lines 22-24; col. 7, line 30. Roberts teaches initiating a subsequent or second service, col. 7, lines 21-25 col. 11, lines 33-37; col. 14, lines 41-45.

10. Regarding claim(s) 12, 16, Roberts teaches an itinerary/list into an object as input to another web service, col. 14, lines 40-44; col. 22, lines 54-62, and as a “queue system”, col. 9, lines 42-43 as an instantiation, col. 12, lines 41-44 of a class, col. 9, lines 52-55; col. 10, lines 15-22.

11. Regarding claim(s) 13, Roberts teaches classes implemented in OOP, col. 2, line 14.

12. Regarding claim(s) 22, Roberts teaches preference for a local serviced provider as services made available internally, col. 5, lines 46-48..

13. Regarding claim(s) 23, Roberts teaches receiving said object, and determining a service provider for said first service, col. 5, lines 56-61, including configuration parameters, col. 6, lines 1-4.

14. Regarding claim(s) 24, Roberts teaches including configuration parameters, col. 6, lines 1-4 that can local, col. 4, lines 123.
15. Regarding claim(s) 25, Roberts teaches an LDAP server for configuration information, col. 6, line 30.

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (571)272-3890. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.
17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.
18. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.

sfw

September 13, 2006

Andrew Caldwell
ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER